

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Status**

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application and are rejected.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-17 and 22-30 are herein amended. Claims 12, 13, 20 and 21 are herein canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by virtue of the claim amendments.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0193687 (Vining).

Applicant respectfully submits that Vining does not disclose the subject matter as claimed in amended independent claim 1.

For example, Vining does not disclose *performing a 2D region growing on an MPD of the lumen*, as claimed. Instead, Vining discloses using a 3D region growing technique to segment a region of interest (see e.g., ¶0031 of Vining). In addition, Vining does not disclose *marking data during the 2D region growing*, as claimed. Rather, Vining discloses manually specifying markers in a volume prior to performing a region growing (see e.g., ¶0036 of Vining). Vining also does not disclose *rendering on the desired portion of the lumen within the marked data*, as claimed. In this regard, Vining discloses rendering an entire wireframe model of a lumen (see e.g., ¶0072 of Vining). Further, there is no disclosure anywhere in Vining of *replacing marked data with a 3D*

*rendered portion of the lumen and displaying an image of the MPR with the 3D rendered portion of the lumen in an area that originally included the marked data, as claimed.*

Thus, Vining does not disclose the subject matter as claimed in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Independent claims 9, 17, 23, 28 and 29 have been amended similarly to claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1. Claims 9, 17, 23, 28 and 29 are also believed to be allowable because Vining does not disclose *calculating a minimum distance and a maximum distance to the endoscope position by using a distance map to identify a part of the desired portion of the lumen that was not included in the first 2D region growing*, as claimed. Instead, Vining discloses using vertices of a wireframe model and normals of these vertices to determine a thickness of a lumen wall (see e.g., ¶¶0045-50 of Vining).

### **Dependent Claims**

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as to why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, supra, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant, however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination. Applicant further submits that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Francis G. Montgomery  
Francis G. Montgomery  
Reg. No. 41,202  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
Tel: (732) 321-3130  
FAX: (732) 590-1290